

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Applicant has amended the Title and Abstract as suggested by the Examiner.

In addition, Applicant has amended Claim 1 in a manner believed to obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Applicant gratefully notes the indicated allowability of dependent Claims 5-6, 8-12. New Claims 14-20 have been added and correspond to original Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 10 and 12, respectively. Original Claims 5-6 and 8-12 have accordingly been cancelled. Therefore, new Claims 14-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 stands rejected under both 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a) over Pejouhy et al. No. 4,622,739. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. In particular, Applicant believes that the characterization of the gasket 24 in Pejouhy as an adhesive layer as recited in Claim 1 is incorrect.

Firstly, gasket 24 of Pejouhy serves to electrically insulate lid 26 from housing 12, since both are made of electrically conductive material.

To the contrary, in the case where the switch according to Claim 1 comprises a conductive lower part 14 and a conductive cover part 17, as in Fig. 2, a separate insulating layer 34 is provided, such layer 34 being independent from and in addition to adhesive layer 32 or adhesive droplet 37 as in Fig. 2. Further, gasket 24 according to Pejouhy forms a complete layer covering all of the inner surface of lid 36.

Therefore, when the switch of Pejouhy is heated to about 500°F (column 4, line 5 of Pejouhy) there is a risk that material from the gasket will drop into the interior of the switch and interfere with the proper functioning of the switch.

To the contrary, according to the subject matter of Claim 1, the adhesive is stamped from the outside onto the switch near the join, there being no adhesive material inside the

switch. Therefore, Pejouhy discloses a completely different technique than that according to new Claim 1. Nothing in Pejouhy would suggest completely replacing the gasket layer 24 by an adhesive droplet that is stamped from outside near the join in order to seal the join.

In other words, it is not the insulative layer between the lower part and the cover part that is melted. Rather, the invention teaches the use, additionally and/or alternatively of an adhesive that is stamped from outside near the join only when the lower part has already been closed by the cover part and the join has been formed.

Therefore, Claim 1 is believed to present patentable subject matter.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 11, 2003

By: Christopher M. Brock
Christopher M. Brock
Reg. No. 27313

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CMB:bg